



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,096	01/11/2005	Martin Hendrix	LE A 35 821	7642
35969 7590 03/03/2009				
Barbara A. Shimei Director, Patents & Licensing Bayer HealthCare LLC - Pharmaceuticals 555 White Plains Road, Third Floor Tarrytown, NY 10591				
EXAMINER				
SAEED, KAMAL A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,096

Applicant(s)

MARTIN HENDRIX

Examiner

Kamal A. Saeed

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12 and 15-42 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 12-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23-42 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 16-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/16/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 10, 13 and 14 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-9, 11, 12, 15 and 16-42 are currently pending in this application. Claims 9 and 12-15 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The withdrawn subject matter is patentably distinct from the elected subject matter as it differs in structure and element and would require separate search considerations. In addition, a reference, which anticipates one group, would not render obvious the other.

RCE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 16, 2009 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 16, 2009 was in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98. The IDS document was considered. A signed copy of form 1449 is enclosed herewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01(a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue."

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

1. The nature of the invention
2. The state of the prior art
3. The predictability or lack thereof in the art
4. The amount of direction or guidance present
5. The presence or absence of working examples
6. The breadth of the claims
7. The quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. The level of skill in the art

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compounds of formula (I) and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, does not reasonably provide enablement for solvates thereof. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01 (A)). These include: nature of the invention, breadth of the claims, guidance of the specification, the existence of working examples, state of the art, predictability of the art and the amount of experimentation necessary. All of the Wands factors have been considered with regard to the instant claims, with the most relevant factors discussed below.

The state of the prior art/level of ordinary skill/level of predictability

Active pharmaceutical ingredients are frequently delivered to the patient in the solid-state as part of an approved dosage form (e.g., tablets, capsules, etc.). Solids provide a convenient, compact, and generally stable format to store an active pharmaceutical ingredient or a drug product. Understanding and controlling the solid-state chemistry of active pharmaceutical ingredients, both as pure drug substances and in formulated products, is therefore an important aspect of the drug development process. Active pharmaceutical ingredients can exist in a variety of distinct solid forms, including polymorphs, solvates, hydrates, salts, co-crystals, and amorphous solids. Each form displays unique physicochemical properties that can profoundly influence the bioavailability, manufacturability purification, stability, and other performance characteristics of the drug. Hence, it is critical to understand the relationship between the particular solid form of a compound and its functional properties.

For ionizable compounds, preparation of salt forms using pharmaceutically acceptable acids and bases is a common strategy to improve bioavailability. However, the preparation of other solid forms, such as polymorphs, solvates and hydrates, are not

so common to be predictable. In order to obtain patent protection on these forms, some of which may have significantly different properties and relevance as development candidates, it is essential to prepare them, identify conditions for making them, and evaluate their properties as valuable new pharmaceutical materials.

Therefore, for the reasons above, the state of the prior art is one of unpredictability.

As stated above, crystalline solids can exist in the form of polymorph, solvates or hydrates. "Phase transitions such as polymorph interconversion, desolvation of solvate, formation of hydrate, and conversion of crystalline to amorphous form may occur during various pharmaceutical processes, which may alter the dissolution rate and transport characteristics of the drug. Hence, it is desirable to choose the most suitable and stable form of the drug in the initial stages of drug development" (Vippagunta et al., abstract). In further discussing the predictability of the formation of solvates, Vippagunta et al. discloses that "predicting the formation of solvates or hydrates of a compound and the number of molecules of water or solvent incorporated into the crystal lattice of a compound is complex and difficult. Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for a series of related compounds" (page 18, section 3.4).

The amount of direction or guidance present/existence of working examples

A disclosure should contain representative examples which provide reasonable

assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds which fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. The specification does not adequately enable a method of making solvates of the compounds that the claims encompass.

There is no data present or any working examples in the specification for the preparation of solvates of said compounds.

Breadth of the claims

The instant breadth of the rejected claims is broader than the disclosure, specifically; the instant claims include any solvates of said compounds.

The quantity of experimentation needed

While the level of skill in the pharmaceutical arts is high, it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to prepare any solvate of said compounds.

The specification provides limited support, as noted above, for the solvates encompassed by the claims. The quantity of experimentation needed to make the solvates encompassed by the claims would be an undue burden on one skilled in the chemical art, since the skilled artisan is given inadequate guidance for the reasons stated above. Also, the science of crystallization has evolved such that, without guidance or working examples in the specification, the claim lacks enablement.

This discussion established *prima facie* non-enablement. Deletion of the word "solvate or a solvate of" from the claims would overcome this rejection.

Objections

Claims 11 and 16-22 are objected to for depending on a rejected base claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23-42 are allowable over the prior art.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kamal A Saeed whose telephone number is (571) 272-0705. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:30 AM- 5:00 PM.

Communication via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR only. For more information about the pair system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

/Kamal A Saeed, Ph.D./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626

